



ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 053785-5133
Application No.: 10/608,232
Page 9

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12, 13, 15-19, 21-28, and 30-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yoneda et al. (US 2001/0026127) in view of Eida et al. (US 5,909,081).

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneda et al. in view of Eida et al. and Kanai et al. (US 6,121,727).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 1, 12, 32, and 33 to further define the invention, and canceled claims 18-31 and 34 without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-17, 32, and 33 are pending for further consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12, 13, 15-19, 21-28, and 30-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yoneda et al. (US 2001/0026127) in view of Eida et al. (US 5,909,081), and claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneda et al. in view of Eida et al. and Kanai et al. (US 6,121,727).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections on grounds that none of the applied references, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest the combination of features recited by amended independent claims 1, 12, 32, and 33.

Independent claims 1, 12, 32, and 33, as amended, recite display devices and a method of fabricating display devices including, in part, “a first electrode on an entire surface of the planarization layer” and a second electrode on the organic electroluminescent layer in “the

plurality of pixel regions.” In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention, Yoneda et al. and Eida et al. both clearly fail to teach or suggest a first electrode on an entire surface of a passivation layer. Specifically, Eida et al. explicitly requires the first electrode patterned by a pixel region and disposed on the protective layer, the organic electroluminescent layer, and the second electrode on the entire surface of the substrate. Furthermore, Yoneda et al. fails to disclose an organic relationship with the passivation layer between the color filter and the organic electroluminescent diode device. Accordingly, since this difference is related to the difference of the driving characteristic between the present invention and Yoneda et al., it is impossible to compare only the structure feature of the organic electroluminescent elements of Yoneda et al. with that of the present invention. Moreover, when the full-color type is applied to the dual panel type according to the present invention, the full-color element can be independently manufactured of the array element. Thus, the process can be stably performed and the structural design margin can be increased. Consequently, the present invention can expect the synergy effect. However, this synergy effect can not be guessed from the referenced applications.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-17, 32, and 33 are neither taught nor suggested by the applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combination of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Date: November 2, 2006

Customer No. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-739-3000